1	TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW LLP		
2	MARC M. GORELNIK (State Bar No. 166833) MARY L. SHAPIRO (State Bar No. 201199) Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor		
3			
4	Facsimile: (415) 576-0300 Email: mmgorelnik@townsend.com mlshapiro@townsend.com		
5			
6			
7	Attorneys for Plaintiff		
8			
9	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
10			
11	TORTIBERRY	SISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
12	WIND OF TRADE LLC, a Nevada limited	Case No. CV 07-06280 MMC	
13	liability company,	Case 140. C v 07-00200 WINTE	
14	Plaintiff,	DECLARATION OF COUNSEL RE: PLAINTIFF'S SERVICE OF THE	
15	v.	COURT'S ORDER OF DECEMBER 14, 2007	
16	MOSTAG INTERNATIONAL, INC., a Pennsylvania corporation,	DECEMBER 14, 2007	
17	Defendant.		
18			
19	I, Marc M. Gorelnik, declare:		
20	1. I am a partner of the law firm of Townsend and Townsend and Crew LLP, the		
21	attorneys for Plaintiff Wind of Trade LLC ("plaintiff") in this case, and am duly licensed to practice in		
22	the State of California. I submit this Declaration of Counsel Re: Plaintiff's Service of the Court's		
23	Order of December 14, 2007. The following facts are within my personal knowledge and I could and		
24	would be competent to testify to them if called as a witness in this matter.		
25	2. The Court's Order Setting Briefing Schedule of December 14, 2007 (the "Order")		
26	requires that plaintiff serve the Order on defendant by December 18 and file the proof of service by		
27	December 21, 2007. Defendant's filing in response to plaintiff's Ex Parte Motion for Temporary		
28	Restraining Order was due December 27, 2007, and plaintiff's reply is due January 2, 2008. As set		

3 4

> 6 7

5

9

10

8

11 12

14 15

13

16 17

18

19 20

21 22

23

24

25 26

27 28

forth in the following paragraphs, plaintiff has complied with its obligations and defendant, now represented by counsel, has not opposed the motion.

- 3. Plaintiff served the Order on Defendant on December 14 using facsimile and FedEx. Plaintiff timely filed its proof of service on December 17. See Docket No. 16. The facsimile confirmation page reflects success in transmission. See true and correct copy of transmission record, Exhibit A hereto. However, FedEx's three attempts at delivery, on December 17, 18, and 21, were not successful. See true and correct copy of FedEx tracking record, Exhibit B hereto.
- 4. In addition to facsimile and FedEx means of service, as reflected in the filed proof of service, plaintiff retained a process server to personally deliver on defendant copies of: (1) the Order; (2) the Court's Case Management Conference Order; and (3) correspondence from myself to defendant's principal, William Pan. See true and correct copy of my correspondence, Exhibit C hereto. In my letter, I reiterated the Court's schedule and implored Mr. Pan to retain counsel.
- 5. I am informed and believe, based on the Declaration of Richard Dougherty filed contemporaneously with my declaration, that the process server went to defendant's place of business on December 18 at 2:20 p.m. EST and contacted the proprietor using the supplied camera/intercom system. The person apparently in charge of Defendant's place of business, believed to be the same person personally served with the Complaint and Summons, refused to come to the door to accept the papers. Instead, the papers were affixed to the front door of defendant's place of business.
- 6. At about 12:50 p.m. PST on December 18, roughly 90 minutes after the process server made the attempted personal delivery, I received a call from a Philadelphia attorney identifying himself as Mark Schaffer. Mr. Shaffer indicated that he was calling on behalf of defendant. We expressly discussed, and I believed that we had agreement on, defendant's stipulation to a preliminary injunction.
- 7. I explained to Mr. Schaffer that defendant must be represented in any filing or appearance by counsel admitted to practice in the Northern District of California. This appeared to present some degree of challenge, but I left resolution in the hands of defendant's counsel.
- 8. I am informed and believe that Mr. Schaffer subsequently spoke to my co-counsel Mary Shapiro and told her that defendant would not oppose plaintiff's motion rather than retain local

counsel. I declare under the penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct. EXECUTED this 2nd day of January, 2008, at San Francisco, California. Solution Solution		
foregoing is true and correct. EXECUTED this 2nd day of January, 2008, at San Francisco, California. Solution San Francisco California San Francisco San Francisco California San Francisco San Francisco California California	1	counsel.
EXECUTED this 2nd day of January, 2008, at San Francisco, California. Js/ Marc M. Gorelnik	2	I declare under the penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	3	foregoing is true and correct.
6 7 Marc M. Gorelnik 8 9 61244376 v1 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	4	EXECUTED this 2nd day of January, 2008, at San Francisco, California.
7 Marc M. Gorelnik 8 61244376 v1 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	5	
7 8 9 61244376 v1 Marc M. Gorelnik 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	6	/s/
9 61244376 v1 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	7	Marc M. Gorelnik
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	8	
11	9	61244376 v1
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	10	
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	11	
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	12	
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	13	
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	14	
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	15	
18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	16	
19 20 21 22 23 24 25	17	
20 21 22 23 24 25		
21 22 23 24 25	ii.	
22 23 24 25	- 11	
23 24 25	- 11	
24 25		
25		
	-	
20		
27 28	- 11	